The Modern Churchman.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

No. 10. JANUARY, 1917. Vol. VII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

The Hereford Scandal.

The English Church Union will learn in time by humiliating experience that it is not the Church of England; that it does not represent a majority of the Church of England; that it merely constitutes a very small minority of that body, albeit, owing to the narrowness and precision of its policy, a highly organized minority.

The Kikuyu controversy made it apparent that the rigid Anglo-Catholics had over-estimated their strength, or at any-rate had failed to give that impression of strength which they desired. As the controversy proceeded it became overwhelmingly clear, not from the decisions of Church representative assemblies, nor even from the utterances of Church authorities, but from the press of the country ranging from the *Times* to *Punch*, and from the *Spectator* to *John Bull*, that the English nation was anti-Zanzibarbarous.

The recent bitter attack upon Dr. Henson, and the organized effort to prevent his elevation to the episcopate, has made it equally apparent that even in clerical circles the E.C.U. and its party are losing ground. Although the secretary of the E.C.U. advertised for signatures to a Memorial against the appointment; although the *Church Times* published a virulent article on "The Hereford Scandal," opening with the words, "Never within living memory has the feeling of Churchmen been more stirred," &c.; although even the *Guardian* so far misjudged official Church opinion as to deplore Dr. Henson's appointment, a *faux pas* since retrieved by a judicious neutrality,

and although even the *Challenge*, the exponent of the Lif and Liberty Movement, surprised its friends by its hostil comments, yet what has the result been? Thirty-three bisho have congratulated Dr. Henson on his elevation; the Herefor Chapter has elected him by fifteen votes to four (the fou being abstentions); the E.C.U., notwithstanding its super organization, only managed to secure some 2,300 signature for its memorial; the Herefordshire Church malcontents eve failed to obtain a hall in Hereford in which to hold a publi meeting of protest. What then is all this bluster of the E.C.U worth? Is it anything more than a clerical storm in a rathe small ecclesiastical tea-cup?

Churchpeople as a whole are well-pleased with the appoin ment of Dr. Henson. The London and provincial press haile the appointment with satisfaction. Englishmen like to see brave and able man promoted, be he soldier or priest. It now manifest that the Hereford scandal is not the scandal the appointment of Dr. Henson, but the scandal of th absolutism and intolerance of the *Church Times* and its friend

Although as English Churchmen we deplore the discred which is done to our Church in the eyes of the world by th recent action of thc E.C.U., yet as Liberal Churchmen w have cause for gratitude that that action has been so signal defeated. The E.C.U. has been for too long the spoilt chi of the English episcopate, the majority of whom have tremble at its roars and screams, and hastily yielded to its threats the only way of promoting peace and unity in the Churc home. The crafty and tyrannical infant having practised, un it has become perfect, the arts of ecclesiastical intimidatio will learn, we hope, from the Hereford scandal that bo Church and nation are able to assess its calculated uproar its real value. Certainly the Prime Minister is hardly like to be frightened by E.C.U. tactics, and the press of the count is getting to recognise that although the E.C.U. may stand f a few thousand clergymen and a score or so of peers an

members of Parliament, it has no real claim to represent the Church of England either in doctrine, policy, or temper. If the Hereford scandal has helped to make this clear to all whom it may concern, it will, like many other painful things, have served a useful purpose.

How to appoint Bishops.

Which is the right way of appointing bishops? is an important question which the elevation of Dr. Henson has raised in an acute form. Scripture tells us what manner of man a bishop ought to be, but it does not tell us how to appoint him. Obviously in the light of Church history, a bishop should be consecrated by bishops, but Church history does not tell us authoritatively how a bishop ought to be elected.

The Apostolic Church of Jerusalem elected St. Matthias to "the bishopric" of Judas by casting lots; in the primitive Keltic Churches the bishops were elected by the abbot of the monastery in which they were to serve; in the Church of the Roman Empire down to the Council of Nicaea, the bishop of the diocese was popularly elected by the *plebs Dei* of his diocese; as the result of the fourth canon of Nicaea bishops in the Eastern Church were elected by the bishops of the province; in the West in the middle ages the cathedral chapter achieved the right to elect the bishop of the diocese; in many countries the right of episcopal election lies to-day with the sovereigns of those countries; in other countries it lies exclusively with the Pope; the Pope himself is elected by the College of Cardinals; in most branches of the Anglican Church abroad the bishop is elected by the Diocesan Synod; in England he is nominated by the Crown, elected by the cathedral chapter of the diocese, but actually appointed by the Prime Minister. It is quite clear, as a modern Roman Catholic canonist writes:—

> "The discipline of the Church with regard to the appointment of bishops has varied from age to age."

What Rudyard Kipling writes of the constructing of tribal lays holds also with regard to the method of appointing bishops.

"There are five and forty ways of constructing tribal lays,
And almost every one of them is right."

The supremely right way of appointing a bishop must be that way which gives us the best bishop in each diocese.

"For forms of government, let fools contest,
Whate'er is best administered is best."

But that method must vary with the conditions of the Christian Church. In a diocese which is but a small country town, popular election may be satisfactory; in a missionary diocese appointment by a missionary society may be the best method of appointment; in a large homogeneous diocese much may be said for the method of synodical election; in a diocese in which party spirit runs high between two or three contending parties the best method will be appointment by some outside authority that will stand above all parties.

There is a very general agreement among thoughtful Churchmen to-day that the appointment of bishops by the Prime Minister, who for the time being represents the English nation, has given to the English Church a much better episcopate than could have been obtained by any other means; and certainly the greatest of our prelates have been men who would not have been elected either by the synodical method or by the *vox populi*, nor need we add by the votes of the clergy.

Besides obtaining good bishops, it is important that English Churchmen as a whole should feel satisfied with the method of their appointment. We believe that the bulk of English Churchmen are satisfied, especially that vast number of Churchmen who are well aware that whatever alteration were made in the appointment of their bishops, they at least would have no direct vote in that appointment. It is true that each of us does not always get the bishop he desires, but as a whole the English Episcopate is probably for its numbers much the best Episcopate in Christendom, and when agitators make wild demands for an alteration in the method of English Episcopal appointments, it is well to recall the sapient observation of the judicious Hooker:—

"There is no man who goeth about to persuade a multitude that they are not so well governed as they ought to be, who shall lack for hearers."

Disestablishment and after.

Our fellow Churchmen who have abandoned the ideal of a National Church, but are not quite sure whether to replace it by an Anglican Episcopal sect, or by two provinces of the Roman Catholic Church, will do well to read *Reform or Revolution in the National Church*,[1] by Dr. Jackson, formerly Rector of Exeter College, Oxford. Dr. Jackson does not set out to prove that a National Church no more conflicts with the ideal of a Catholic Church, than family prayers need conflict with parochial services, or strongly marked personality in an individual with great powers of social service. If anyone wishes to study the argument for a National Church, and cares not to go for it to the Tudor or Georgian divines, let him study chapter v. "The Church and the Nation," in F. D. Maurice's *Kingdom of Christ*. He will there find as little to support the claim to ecclesiastical autonomy on the part of the English Church, if that claim means the denial of the rights and distinctions of National Churches, as he will to support political Erastianism.

Dr. Jackson's pamphlet is a cautious but weighty criticism of the Archbishops' *Report on Church and State*. The weakness of the *Report* is that it does not do justice to *the growing desire that the National Church shall become a focus of union for all Christians throughout the Nation and Empire*. That the Church has claims for becoming such, Dr. Jackson sees in her earnest striving to become the Church of the poor, to keep clear of party politics, and to win to Christian faith those who stand outside all Churches. Her increasing vigour and vitality need, however, to be united to the spirit of tolerance, a readiness to face facts, and a willingness to co-

[1] *Reform or Revolution in the National Church*, by W. W. Jackson. Pub. Oxford University Press. Price 1/-.

operate with all who desire to permeate the national life with the spirit of Christ.

Dr. Jackson is anxious that all Church reforms shall strengthen and not hinder the development of these gifts and graces. He marks in a narrow Church franchise such a hindrance. Hence he advocates the baptismal franchise and the abandonment of the negative declaration of non-membership in any other Christian communion.

He realises also the serious consequences of Disestablishment.

> "The Church of England is older than the State. It was established because it was a National Church. It did not become the National Church because it was established, but if it were disestablished it would cease to be the National Church" (p. 9).

Disestablishment would be accompanied by a large measure of Disendowment, and the probable loss of our cathedrals. But this is not all, and we would beg the Life and Liberty Movement to mark this.

> "Before handing over any remnant of revenue not appropriated by the State, it would be necessary to create a new body, an Episcopal Church no doubt, to which the House of Commons would consent to transfer that remnant. The constitution of the proposed body would have to be acceptable to the House of Commons, that is, to the vast majority of the nation. . . . There can be no doubt that the kind of Church constituted with the consent of the House of Commons will be very distinctly Protestant both in name and in its standards of faith. In fact all the characteristics of the Church of England at present objected to by High Churchmen would in the new-fangled sect be intensified" (p. 10).

This exchange of an ancient National Church for a disestablished "State-manufactured" Church is not an exchange to be courted by any of our fellow Churchmen except they be crypto-Romans who know that our English Church is the *bête noir* of the Jesuit, or wild Socialists who feel that the best way to smash the State is to begin by smashing the Church.

Dr. Jackson utters sober judgments in regard to Parochial Councils, Lay Patronage, the Final Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes, and other controversial matters. Whilst his appeal is addressed mainly to the Archbishops and Bishops

to encourage them to rise to the opportunities and responsibilities which the demand for Church Reform has multiplied, it is not one to be ignored by any Churchman anxious for the future welfare of the National Church.

How the Laity would Reform the Church.

It is not easy to learn what the laity think about Church Reform. Our knowledge is mainly negative. We only know that they do not think what the Houses of Laymen think. Unfortunately, the views of laymen usually come to us in the form of criticism not construction. Last month, however, the London Lay Readers' Association, after three meetings held in St. Paul's Chapter-house for the consideration of the Archbishops' *Report on Church and State*, deputed Mr. Edmund Kimber, one of their number and a member of the Churchmen's Union, to draft a Bill for securing freedom for the Church; the Bill to be of such a character as to be likely to pass both Houses of Parliament. This Mr. Kimber has done, and has favoured us with a copy of it, which we publish in full:—

Public Worship Regulation Bill.

A BILL TO

Improve and enlarge the scope of Public Worship in the Church of England and the better regulation thereof.

WHEREAS for some time past it has been publicly felt both inside and outside the Church of England that it has not been fulfilling the public usefulness for which it was designed, and the present lamentable war has brought about a widespread liberality of thought and action in religious matters which for the public good ought to be encouraged, perpetuated, and enlarged.

AND WHEREAS many efforts have been made in several directions to improve the administration of the Church of England without avail and it is desirable to extend its usefulness for the public good and to enlarge its sphere of operations.

Be it therefore enacted by the King's Most Excellent Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in this present Parliament assembled and by the authority of the same as follows:—

1. From and after the passing of this Act no Archbishop or Bishop shall be nominated or appointed by the Crown or any of its Ministers but they shall be elected in the manner hereinafter mentioned.

2. Any future Archbishop of Canterbury shall be chosen and elected from the number of existing Bishops by the Churchwardens in the Province of Canterbury.

3. Any future Archbishop of York shall be chosen in like manner from the number of existing Bishops in the Province of York.

4. Every Bishop in both Provinces shall be chosen by the Churchwardens of the different Dioceses in which the Bishopric becomes vacant, from among the clergy of the Diocese.

5. Every Churchwarden may signify his assent to or dissent from the election of a person nominated, as hereinafter prescribed by rules.

6. The Churchwardens of every parish or district parish shall be elected by the baptized members of the Church resident in the parish or district parish.

7. Such members shall also elect a Parish Council of seven such members, who shall be called together and consulted by the Churchwardens on all matters affecting the government and welfare of the Church generally and particularly including such elections as aforesaid.

8. In case of any contested election the Churchwardens shall take a ballot in person and by proxy at such times and places and in such convenient manner as they may appoint, if funds are available for that purpose. If there are no funds then the choice of the Churchwardens shall be final.

9. Every church shall continue to have two Churchwardens as at present, but they shall both be elected by the baptized members of the Church, in the parish or district parish in which the church is situated at a Meeting to be called for that purpose every year in Easter week, a ballot being taken if demanded by twelve of such parishioners.

10. No living or Ecclesiastical office in the gift of the Crown or any other person, shall be filled or preferred to by them, but the same shall be filled or preferred to in the case of an Archdeaconry, Deanery, Prebend, or Canonry, by the vote of the baptized members of the church of the city in which they are situated, and in the case of any parochial or other livings by such members in the parish or place in which they are situated.

11. No change shall be made in the services of any church and no alterations in the fabric of the church without the consent of nine-tenths of the baptized members in the parish or district parish in which such church is situated.

12. The Parish Council or the Churchwardens shall be at liberty to prescribe what aid may be given to their Minister or Incumbent by Lay Readers or the Ministers of any of what are called the Free Churches.

13. Should the Parish Council disapprove of the conduct of their Minister or Incumbent they may give him three months' notice to vacate

his office, but such notice shall state the grounds of such disapproval, and if the Minister or Incumbent should dispute them he may carry the case by petition to the nearest County Court Judge, who may summon to his assistance, if he please, the Bishop of the Diocese. All other ecclesiastical causes and disputes shall be settled by the same tribunal, and any appeal therefrom shall be direct to the Privy Council.

14. From and after the passing of this Act both Houses of Convocation shall cease to exist, and in lieu thereof an Ecclesiastical Council shall be elected every three years of which the Archbishops and Bishops shall form part and the rest shall be 100 in number, who shall be chosen by the Churchwardens of all the parishes in the kingdom, according to the number of Churchmen and Church women in their respective parishes. Such Council shall determine all matters of doctrine or ritual, but a referendum may be had to the electors should one-third of the members of the Council desire it.

15. A woman being a member of the Church may hold any ecclesiastical office therein, except that of Minister or Lay Reader.

16. In the unavoidable absence of any Minister through illness or accident, a Lay Reader may perform all the services and administer the Sacraments.

17. Any Minister may occasionally exchange pulpits with any Minister of the Free Churches, if approved of by the Churchwardens.

18. The Churchwardens shall, from among themselves, appoint a Committee of twenty members to prescribe Rules for carrying out the elections and other matters in this Act required for that purpose.

We do not anticipate that this Bill will ever become law, nevertheless it deserves attention as being, we believe, a much better reflection of the views and feelings of the average active and interested layman in the matter of Church Reform than that which is furnished by the Archbishops' Report. It is very simple, comprehensive, practical, and essentially laic. We observe:—

(1) That it stands emphatically for the baptismal franchise. (Presumably these baptized parishioners must be adults, and registered).

(2) That the patronage of all livings, prebends or canonries, archdeaconries, deaneries, and even bishoprics, is to be administered by the local laity either directly or as represented by their Churchwardens who themselves in every case are elected by the parochial laity. The spirit of this proposal is primitive enough to suit the age of the Apostles, and democratic enough to please our own.

(3) That the consent of nine-tenths of the parochial laity must be obtained for alterations in the Church services and fabric. This is interesting testimony to the intense dislike of the laity to changes too often made on the initiative of the clergyman alone.

(4) That the inherent priesthood of the laity may in case of necessity (the unavoidable absence or illness of the minister) be exercised in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments by the Lay Reader. There seems to be no desire, however, for women to act in this capacity.

(5) That Church law shall be administered not by clerics but by trained lay lawyers.

(6) That the interchange of pulpits with Nonconformists is favoured.

(7) That no confidence is felt in Convocation, but overwhelming confidence in responsible parochial laymen.

Judged by this document, the laity favour ecclesiastical liberalism combined with conservatism in Church worship. The Mass *versus* Matins movement would obviously receive a short shrift under this new system of Church government.

We regard clause 13 as too drastic. A despotic congregationalism deprives the pulpit of prophetic power and freedom. The clergy ought to be neither servile nor tyrannical. Insecurity of tenure may easily make them the first, and complete independence the second.

If we had to choose between the Reform Scheme of the Archbishops' Report, and that of the London Lay-Readers' Association (supposing the Lay-Readers adopt it) we should choose the second.

This second scheme would certainly give us a comprehensive National Church and real self-government without any alteration of the relations of Church and State; for a Church governed in this way would quickly become national, and would have no difficulty in passing through Parliament any measure it really desired.

A Naval Point of View.

The Church Pennant, the official organ of the Naval Church Society, publishes in its December number a significant article on Church Reform by a layman. We gather from its statements that the naval Churchman does not differ very much from his landsman brother in his view of the reforms desired. He wants Prayer-book reform; he wants prayers which voice modern needs in modern terms; he wants sermons on burning and practical questions in unconventional language; he wants closer religious relations with Nonconformists; he wants the aridities of doctrinal and ritual disputes relegated to the past, and the emphasis placed on the simple essentials of the Christian Faith and on the promotion of justice, mercy, and righteousness.

As Grenfell of Labrador writes:—

> "It is not so much for holding services, as for rendering services, that the world is looking to the Church to-day."

The writer notes "the splendid and fearless work of individual chaplains" and "the good work done by the Church during the war," but it is clear to him that the Church has not yet solved, and it is doubtful how far she has yet really faced the problem which besets her on every side, and which the writer states thus:—

> "We have only to look round amongst the people we are associated with to find in vast numbers of cases not indifference to Christianity, but utter indifference to the kind of Christianity expressed by the Church."

The fact is that the Christianity of the dogmatic theologian has no power of attraction. Theological theories, schemes of salvation, definitions of the indefinable, are as irritating to the modern man as was the scholasticism of the mediaeval theologians to Dean Colet. As a writer remarks in the January *Hibbert Journal*:—

> "We have been keen controversialists, and now, before the stupendous tragedy of the war, controversy is as dead as Dickens' famous door-nail. The man in the Y.M.C.A. hut doesn't care a straw about the affirmation or the denial of the Trinity. Discourses on the

fall of man or the flames of hell sound to him like the rattling of dried peas in a bladder. The great matters of life and experience are quite otherwise. If you ask what they are, listen to St. Paul: 'Love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance.' What a divine catalogue! Or again: 'Whatsoever things are true, just, pure, lovely, and of good report.'" (p. 317).

The Modern Missionary.

The modern clergyman needs to be as "full of knowledge" as George Herbert's Country Parson. He needs to learn not only from the historical, scientific, and philosophical teachers of the university; from the social workers and philanthropists of the slums; but also not least from the Christian missionary in foreign lands.

The older sort of foreign missionary literature had its uses, but it lacked much of the interest and educative value of the modern missionary's writings, because it was less scientific and less sympathetic towards the religious and social ideals with which the Christian missionary came into contact, and not unusually into conflict.

The World Missionary Conference held at Edinburgh in June, 1910, demonstrated the extraordinary vitality and vigour of the methods and outlook of Christian missions. It might be said to have marked the dividing line between the old age of foreign missions and the new. The nine excellently printed volumes containing the Report of that Conference ought to be studied by all persons who desire to understand the outlook, methods, and goal of the modern Christian missionary. Almost contemporary with the publication of that great series a number of popular modern missionary books appeared: *The Reproach of Islam*, by W. H. T. Gairdner; *The Uplift of China*, by A. H. Smith; *The Desire of India*, etc., but most important of all, *The Decisive Hour of Christian Missions*, by Dr. J. R. Mott.

These books while permeated with evangelical fervour are all marked by the modern spirit, a spirit which we see admirably exemplified in *The International Review of Missions*.

A little book[1] breathing the same spirit has just appeared, by Principal Holland (Fellow of Allahabad University). Its theme is Hindu India. Its tone is sympathetic, open-minded, and optimistic. Mr. Holland feels that India in the matter of religion, has not only much to learn from the Christian missionary, but also much to teach him.

> "India is the spiritual mother of half mankind. That is her supreme significance. That is her meaning, her importance, her fascination for the world to-day. . . . No book that sets out to unveil for other peoples the heart of India could put anything else but religion in the fore-front. . . . Religion in India is not a garment worn at certain times or by certain people. It is the framework and the warp of Indian life. . . . It is the natural expression of the Hindu view of life. . . . Yes, India is, in the language of her greatest living poet, incorrigibly religious" (pp. 7-10).

No religious man, who has been educated to view religion in the modern manner as the supreme expression of the human soul can live in such a country as India without feeling the spell of its all-embracing reverence. Yet it is to be observed that the religious problem of the Hindu is very different from the religious problem of the Christian. The Christian asks: How can I be saved from sin? The Hindu: How can I be saved from existence? One great advantage of studying Hinduism is that it helps a Christian to understand his own religion better. We remember a Jewish Rabbi commenting on the attraction of Theosophy for the modern Englishman by saying, "Yes, the Aryan is going back to his native religion." That remark raises more questions than it answers, but whatever the racial religion of the Englishman may have been in pre-historic times, there is little doubt that if he values religion at all to-day, he will realise that the Christian religion not necessarily in its English, or Latin, or Greek form, but as it comes from the life and lips of its Founder, has values for the modern world whether of India or England, which Hinduism with all its attractiveness does not possess. In India he can see asceticism, mysticism, pantheism, worked out to the highest

[1] *The Goal of India*, by W. G. S. Holland. Pub. by Student Christian Movement, price 2/-.

power, but the union of religion with the practice of the highest moral self-control; the union of religion with active self-denying social service; the union of religion with the promise of the life that now is as well as of that which is to come, he will not find in Hinduism, for these things are essentially Christian. Rabindranath Tagore has predicted that the destiny of the East is to spiritualise the West. We do not deny it, but would urge that the duty of the West is to humanise and moralise the East. The Hindu needs to have spirituality united to morality, and to find his religious life developed in an existence in which body, mind, and conscience, live in harmony and mutual love and reverence.

The function of the modern Christian teacher face to face with Hinduism is not to combat atheism and materialism, but

> "to give practical demonstration of the vital connection between religious truth and morality, communion with God and life in the world, prayer and works. . . . India needs pre-eminently the social gospel, needs to see the higher spiritual life lived in the path of worldly duty. And therefore a godly Indian commonwealth is the goal no less of the Christian Church than of the British administration. . . . Young India, whether Christian or Hindu, has perceived this, and wants a religion which does not divide what God has joined together—Ultimate Truth and Human Activity in a Real World" (pp. 232-4).

In these words, we have set forth the modern Indian missionary's ideal. His methods are equally modern. He believes that the special function of the modern Indian missionary is training and education rather than evangelization—the equipping of an indigenous Indian Church—there are now some 4,000,000 Indian Christians—which would carry on and complete the evangelization of the races of India.

Three facts of particular interest may be noted in Mr. Holland's book.

(1) Although Mrs. Besant loudly trumpets social reform, her Central College and Theosophical Schools do not admit outcastes.

(2) The Decalogue is used in an abridged form in teaching Indian converts, although this is not yet permitted in the case of English children.

(3) The Indian National Congress, an exclusively political body, and mainly composed of Hindus, recently opened its sessions with the following prayer:—

> "O, most Gracious God and Father, by Whose Divine providence mankind is ruled, and all things are made to work out His good ends, we thank Thee for enabling us, Thy unworthy servants, to assemble once more in this great city. We bless Thy Holy Name that Thou didst put into the hearts of our leaders, some of whom have now departed this life, to establish this Congress, and didst grant them wisdom and ability to maintain and develop it in the face of manifold and vast difficulties.
>
> "We seek Thy blessing, O Heavenly Father, on the proceedings of the present session of our Congress. Give to the President and to all speakers the guidance of Thy Holy Spirit, so that nothing may be said or done here that is not in accordance with Thy Holy Will. Remove from us all ill-feeling, prejudice, and uncharitableness, and fill our hearts with a genuine desire for the good of the country and its people, with unswerving loyalty to our rulers, and with good feelings towards all sections of the inhabitants of this land. . . . Enable those that bear rule in this land to realize their unique responsibilities, and help them to fulfil the sacred charge committed to them, so as to glorify Thy Name, and to benefit our people. Pardon our many shortcomings, strengthen our infirmities, bless our labours, and bestow on us such a measure of success as Thou thinkest fit. Grant us the spirit of self-effacement and self-sacrifice, and accept our humble services to the glory of Thy Holy Name, and the good of our beloved Motherland." Amen.

Why do not these people, who seem so Christian in feeling, confess Christ definitely and become members of the Christian Church? Because to do so in many cases would require them to renounce their nationality, their social position, and probably their means of subsistence.

An Oft-told Tale.

Reform in the training of the clergy is being pressed more and more upon the attention of our Church authorities, and with very good reason, for, as the Rev. Neville Talbot, M.C., writes in *The Church in the Furnace*,

> "Unless the clergy of the Church of England are better trained in the future than in the past, other measures of Church Reform will be neutralised."

While Mr. Talbot commends the work of the Theological Colleges in developing devotion and zeal, he observes that they

failed in inculcating a love of truth, and have too often been homes of reactionary thought. For Liberal Churchmen this is an oft-told tale, but we have reason indeed to be thankful when Mr. Talbot undertakes to relate it to the Church authorities. In their case, what is said is of little importance compared with who says it.

Mr. Talbot's proposals for reform have no air of novelty for Liberal Churchmen; they are on the same lines as the C.U. Report of May, 1917. Of the curriculum for Army ordinands he writes:—

> "She [the Church] must be ready to absolve men from the knowledge of Greek and Latin. She must spare them the insincerity of being concerned with the Thirty-nine Articles. Her chief aim must be to admit them by sound educational method into a thorough and enlightened understanding of the Bible."

In regard to Army candidates he utters an important word of warning;—

> "They will probably be restless and in reaction from discipline. Some of them will lack initiative and independence. . . . Many will have suffered mental and moral relaxation. In general cultivation, it is hardly too much to say, they will be almost barbarians, they will need thorough and rigorous training."

Mr. Talbot believes that the task of training these men will be too much for the Universities and Theological Colleges, and that Whitehall, and the Workers' Educational Association, and the Labour Leaders, must be called in to assist. We venture to think he might have added the Royal Navy and the Metropolitan Fire Brigade. However, we must blame the Kaiser and not our countrymen for this state of things.

From a sermon[1] preached last term by Professor E. W. Watson before the University of Oxford, it would appear that he looks forward to the 'scrapping' of all Theological Colleges except those in close connection with a University, and desires that Oxford should grant a Diploma in Theology which ordinands of every denomination might be glad to receive and

[1] Published by Longmans, price 1/-.

our Bishops would accept as a substitute for the intellectual portions of the Deacons' examination.

Dr. Watson holds that the training of the clergy must be not that of specialists, but of general practitioners. Especially must ordinands be taught to think clearly and on large lines. What the clergy need more than any other profession, is a general, liberal education.

His sermon is remarkable for the excellence of its *obiter dicta*. We venture to quote several of them:—

"Practice in ignoring difficulties is not the best discipline for those who must face them."

"A University has no higher function than that of teaching successive generations to define their terms."

"Liberal education, of which Johnson, for an Englishman is no small part."

"Those moral problems for which the English genius has a particular bent."

"There is a lesson for us still in the doctrine of the old Franciscans that when choice must be made between sermon and mass, the sermon must be chosen."

"Liberal education is a process of widening, the danger of ecclesiasticism, of the seminary spirit, is that it narrows, and the sacristan mind loves to be narrowed."

Dr. Headlam, sometime Principal of King's College, London, n his recent book on *The Revenues of the Church of England*, as a chapter on the training of the clergy, in which he emarks:—

"Christianity is largely presented in a manner alien to present-day ideals. A great many of the clergy are inadequately trained for presenting it."

His remedy is to endow properly equipped Theological Colleges in connection with each of the new Universities.

Prosper Mérimée used to say:—

"England is an admirable country where reforms proposed by Liberals are executed by Conservatives."

---

rchaeology for the Clergy.

Dr. Dukinfield Astley contributes an interesting article to his month's *Hibbert Journal*, in which he pleads that the lergy should be archaeological students. Liturgical studies,

and a love of Gothic architecture are generally believed to lead English clergymen to Rome. It might be supposed therefore that archaeology, which begins where geology ends and extends down to a century or so ago, would have even more deplorable results. However, Dr. Astley, who is a member of the Churchmen's Union, has naturally no desire to encourage clerical mediaevalism, but he is desirous that clergymen should have a comprehensive knowledge of the past, not simply because such knowledge enriches life, but because it promotes both reverence and understanding. "The proper study of mankind is man," and no one can know what man is without knowing what he has done, and how he has lived. Archaeology is not only necessary for the understanding of much of the Old Testament and of some of the New, but it is especially needful in understanding and appreciating many of the things with which a clergyman and his flock are brought into contact to-day. Our cathedrals and ancient parish churches offer an immense and attractive field for archaeology, and many of the clergy have made important contributions to it. Thomas Carlyle held that every clergyman should write the history of his own parish. At least he ought to know that history and teach it to his people. The history of an English country parish, and it is mainly the rural clergy who are able to cultivate this study, is full of delights and surprises. With the multiplication of good libraries and of local archaeological societies, it is also an inexpensive study. In any case Modernism has nothing to fear from knowledge; it is ignorance that is its mortal enemy.

We are inclined to suppose that Dr. Astley's particular "Plea for Archaeology among the Clergy," in the *Hibbert Journal*, may have been suggested to him by the fact that an able article by him on "Folk-stories and Survivals in the Old Testament," published in the *Norwich Diocesan Gazette* for September last, has been vigorously attacked by some of his fellow clergy, who would have been more appreciative had they had more knowledge of Semitic archaeology.

HERESY OR HISTORY?

By the Editor.

The elevation of Dr. Henson has brought into prominence the highly debatable question: What is orthodoxy?

The *Record* formed an honourable exception to the Church weekly press by supporting warmly Dr. Henson's elevation. Its support was given on the ground of his able championship of Kikuyu, and his courageous action in preaching in Non-conformist pulpits. The *Record*, however, seemed to be aware that some persons might stand in doubt of Dr. Henson's orthodoxy, but hoped, in order to remove honest doubt from the minds of all Churchmen, that Dr. Henson would take an early opportunity to "vindicate the views he holds on fundamental articles of the faith." Yet whilst making this suggestion, the *Record* appeared to evince no uneasiness as to Dr. Henson's orthodoxy. The Dean of Canterbury appeared equally assured on the point, for in a letter to the *Times* protesting against the "improper and uncharitable" action of the E.C.U. party in agitating against Dr. Henson's appointment, he allowed that if Dr. Henson's opponents could allege any definite disqualification in doctrine against Dr. Henson, they would be justified in the course they had taken.

Dr. Stone, Principal of Pusey House, in reply to Dr. Wace, made a definite allegation of unorthodoxy against Dr. Henson, basing his charge upon certain passages contained in Dr. Henson's books, viz., *The Creed in the Pulpit*, *Sincerity and Subscription*, *The Liberty of Prophesying*. This charge was met by Dr. Sanday in a long letter to the *Times*, in which, while claiming a close similarity between his own views and Dr. Henson's, he justified them on the lines of his article

on "Continuity of Thought and Relativity of Expression" published in the *Modern Churchman* of June, 1915. The result of these two letters was to lead Dr. Wace to acknowledge that there was abundant justification for the E.C.U.'s action and to join in the appeal made, meanwhile, by Dr. Gore to the Primate not to consecrate Dr. Henson.

What the passages charged against Dr. Henson prove beyond all contradiction, is not that he is unorthodox, but that he is a Liberal Churchman. It may be assumed from these passages that Dr. Henson, whether or not he has decided definitely against the Virgin Birth and the physical resurrection of our Lord, yet attaches no particular weight to them in connection with the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Resurrection. He believes in the Incarnation as every orthodox Liberal Churchman must, but the Virgin Birth is for him a minor consideration. As a historical scholar he seems disposed to regard the evangelical narratives of our Lord's birth as belonging less to history than to poetry, and to hold that the Incarnation was "effected in the normal working of the Divine providence."

So also whilst believing as every orthodox Liberal Churchman must in the resurrrction from death of our Saviour, he does not hold that the narrative of the empty tomb is of vital importance to the resurrection, and is of opinion that this also may be learnt from a careful study of St. Paul's writings.

Mr. Bumble thus delivered his verdict on the cause of Oliver Twist's outbreak. "It's not Madness; ma'am, it's Meat." May we not say of Dr. Henson's doctrine? "Its not Heresy, it's History." The obscurantists and mediaevilists have no particular liking for modern historical research. We sympathise with them. Historical criticism is a very great nuisance. The truth of science, whether physical or historical, demands incessant re-adjustment of our own views; it warns us not to think that we can retain the Risen Christ by treasuring His grave-clothes, or behold the Incarnate God by visiting the cave

at Bethlehem; it teaches us often amid much mental and even spiritual perturbation that if we would hold fast the Faith once for all delivered to the saints and transmit it to others, we must strive to apprehend it in the light of the thought and knowledge of our own age.

Dr. Stone and the E.C.U. may choose to assert that those who to-day do not believe in the Virgin Birth and the physical resurrection are heretics; we can only reply that those who in the Middle Ages did not believe that the descent into hell meant the harrowing of hell, and that the ascension was a physical ascent into a heaven situated above the Mount of Olives, would also have been regarded as heretics. The Church, however, lives and learns. To-day we see that although belief in the *facts* of the Incarnation and Resurrection is essential to orthodoxy, yet belief in any particular *mode* of these facts or transactions, whether traditional or modern, is not of the essence of orthodoxy. When will our traditionalist Churchmen recognise and permit this distinction? They must do it in the end. Why not do it now? Our traditionalists fought hard for belief in a particular mode of the creation as being the only orthodox belief. As a result they created a bitter and injurious antagonism between Christianity and Science. In the end they have had to yield and to acknowledge that, providing we believe in God as the Creator, Christians are free to hold whatever view of the mode of creation they will. Do our traditionalists wish to create an equally painful and needless division to-day between Christianity and History by insisting that Christians must believe in one particular mode of the Incarnation and Resurrection, although there are many serious historical difficulties in regard to that mode? Has the history of Christian doctrine taught them nothing? How often has the crude orthodoxy of one age of the Church become the heresy of the next age? As for Dr. Gore's "scraps of paper" argument in his solemn protest, it is only worthy of the waste paper basket.

Professor Sanday concluded his letter to the *Times* with these words of warning:—

> "I forbear from pointing out to Dr. Stone the dangerous ground on which he is treading; and I hope that he and his friends will desist from carrying this controversy further."

We know that our friends, the traditionalists, have not thought of heeding this warning. Dr. Gore's "Solemn Protest" is probably but the first of a number. They will not prevent Dr. Henson's consecration, but such protests have a dramatic, sentimental, and minatory value, in the eyes of their promoters.

Dr. Gore knows that the only effective way of proceeding is to have Dr. Henson formally charged with heresy and tried in accordance with the law of the Church and Realm. But although the E.C.U. party has no hesitation in making accusations of heresy in the press, and in trying their fellow-Churchmen in the correspondence columns of newspapers, it seems to have as strong an objection to the decisions of the trained legal intellect as to those of the trained critical scholar. We cannot forget that Dr. Gore, on a former occasion, inhibited Dr. Henson, but when Dr. Henson ignored the inhibition and challenged legal prosecution, Dr. Gore dared not proceed, and we may assume that he will go no further in this case.

Our E.C.U. extremists must learn to live in harmony with their fellow Liberal Churchmen and to tolerate their views. Although all Churchmen cannot agree, at least all Churchmen can abstain from persecution, and persecution which seems to Liberals somewhat underhand. We are sure that there are a number of Liberal clergymen who are quite willing to be tried for heresy in regard to the issues raised by the present attack on Dr. Henson, but they resent the way in which traditionalists disturb the peace of the Church and injure the reputations of Liberal Churchmen by denunciation and agitation, and yet will not take legal proceedings against those whom they thus denounce. Such action seems to Liberals to be lacking in

straight-forwardness. Let the E.C.U. prosecute, or else let it cease to persecute.

To attack views and arguments and shew that they are heretical, is, no doubt, a quite justifiable proceeding, but to make personal attacks on a fellow-clergyman on the occasion of his promotion, is not a Christian proceeding. If a clergyman is a heretic, have him tried and deprived, but forbear by denunciation and delation to drive him from his post before the authorities have pronounced him guilty.

The ecclesiastical manners of the E.C.U. like its doctrines are mediaeval, not modern; and we venture to suggest that if the E.C.U. cannot modernise its doctrines it might at least try to modernise and, may we add, Christianize its manners.

There is a humorous side to the Henson heresy hunt. Traditionalist Churchmen protested solemnly against Dr. Gore's consecration on the ground of his concessions to Old Testament criticism. Dr. Gore protests solemnly against Dr. Henson's consecration on the ground of his concessions to New Testament criticism. Thus amidst the contentions of theologians is theology developed, and the persecuted heretic of one age becomes the persecuting inquisitor of the next.

We venture to hope that Dr. Henson will make no reply to the charges of unorthodoxy. Any reply he makes will either be regarded as a recantation of his past teaching, or if the recantation theory is obviously absurd, then as a reiteration, not simply of his already published statements, but of the interpretations put upon them by his accusers.

RELIGION IN THE RANKS.

By Hope Bagenal, D.C.M., Ex-Sergeant, R.A.M.C.

Religion, and all the word stands for, is a region of th soldier's mind more difficult to survey than any other with accuracy. Ethics, art, morality, can be defined and describe because, at some points in our lives, we carry them int action. Not only are we stonily reserved about religion, bu true religion is very difficult to express crudely, in the way w express other things. It is as if the passing away of the ol symbols had left the simple minded actually without th means of religious expression. Whatever power religion ha in the army to shape a man, it seems to be within him some where beyond ordinary consciousness, unexpressed in actio therefore, for the majority of us, not expressed at all.

Morality, on the other hand, is easily observable among us Its striking prevalence is obvious, in spite of occasiona journalistic scares. There are many who identify moralit with religion. Yet in war there are times when the differenc between the two must be obvious to the least thoughtful. A the front a man may be as honest, truthful, chaste, as arm life permits, yet be as irreligious as his companions. Hi morality is his possession, a practical thing, which he may o may not have with him, like his gas helmet. But religion i an inspiration; something noticeably added to his mind an revealing itself, perhaps but for a moment, as courage wher there was once despair, as helpfulness where there was onc fear. Or, perhaps rarest of all, revealed in a consistent qui patience and refusal to complain. I think it is true to say a the outset that morality among us is both apparent and real, bu that religion is not apparent and may or may not be real. have come across remarkable exceptions to the general rule, bu I have not been alone in feeling again and again in the ranks tha so little religious feeling was almost incredible among men face so continuously with death and the chances of death.

I remember speaking on one occasion to a Church of England curate who had enlisted as a Private in the Motor Transport. We had been to a Communion Service, and out of a unit of two hundred there were only at most five N.C.O.'s and men who had attended. This was the customary number. Our conversation was the conversation of men who did not wish to believe evidence, but who were compelled to accept it. We had both some experience. I think what was borne in upon both of us then, and still more as time went on, was that the common evidence of Christianity was lacking in the lives of common men. There was no cant or religious hypocrisy, neither was there superstition nor any mystical sense. There were neither good nor bad symptoms of a religious inheritance. There were apparently, no symptoms at all. We lived a materialist, physical life, and inclined to the materialist view that religion meant only the following of a number of negative commandments.

The moral or the utilitarian view was common enough. What was never apparent was the spiritual. In discussion of important subjects, such as religion, patriotism, or the future life, no clue as to the ultimate motives can be discovered as a rule, because we omit from our considerations the things that matter, such as love, fear, admiration, or worship, and only touch upon details of morality or prejudice. We are so reserved, or so ignorant, that we have lost the power to understand our own motives. I have asked several friends, at various times, why they enlisted. The answers are—"Because I was drunk at the time," "Because my pals did," "Because of the adventure," and these blinds were drawn by the speaker not against me so much as against himself; for this reserve of the soul is often accompanied by a broad confidence and intimacy in affairs of the heart. I have said that the old symbols had passed away and left us dumb. I mean by that the whole language and imagery of Christianity. The ignorance even of the text of the Gospels is very great. Our

knowledge of the Bible is chiefly of the Old Testament, and we are unaware that any difference in spirit exists between Old and New. The sayings of Christ are more called in question than the lessons of the Old Testament, because, as a rule, only a few of His more paradoxical sayings are familiar to us. Men know their hymn-books, moreover, much better than they know Old or New Testament. Their idea of Christ, such as it is, comes largely from English hymnology.

It is an unequal struggle between the religious spirit thus covered and bound, and the vast forces of science and materialism that beset us on every side. There is so little to make us believe that Religion is a reality or something to be enquired into, in daily life, while everything makes for its very successful criticism. It is not generally realised that the scientific conceptions of the last century have percolated down to all classes in various inaccurate translations.

It has been my experience in most gatherings to find one man who says that Religion is a thing of the past, or words to that effect. The calling in question of the Divinity of Christ is fairly common. A man once said to me in hospital, "Who was Christ, then, after all? I bet I've suffered more pain in this bed than He ever suffered."

A rifleman said to me once, "What if Jesus Christ had taken the devil's offer, and accepted the kingdoms of the world. Just think—no war!—no social problems! What if He made a mistake then?"

Everywhere when religion comes forward as a topic, criticism is unafraid and outspoken, but explanation and support are silent. Everywhere the food for criticism is so obvious and easy to point to, and materialist leanings so easy to strengthen by a hundred superficial arguments.

It is not that such symptoms were not known to many of us before the War; but now in army life their full force seems to be focussed upon men's minds, and in our unhappiness, cut off from public opinion at home, debarred from creative occupation,

leading a life we detest, we re-act equally against true ideals and mock heroics in a spirit of revenge. This is difficult to understand for people who have not been at the front, but it cannot be ignored. Yet it is in just such conditions that the idea of Christ might make a powerful appeal. I claim for truth's sake that irreligion is the rule, but the exceptions go far to disprove it.

As a rule nothing is apparently farther from the average man's consciousness than the thought of Christ. Yet I know one man who was lead to think about religion by the number of crucifixes he saw, and who was eventually confirmed in order that he might attend Communion.

Another man, who had been a gardener before the war, was in the habit of borrowing my books. We were great friends, and on one occasion in billets I began to read him Browning's *Saul*. On the following night he asked me most earnestly to continue it. I did so, and the end of the poem, "See the Christ stand" interested him deeply. Conversation with him, and to a less degree with others, led me to believe that Christ *as an idea* had never been brought to his notice, that Christ as something for the mind and brain was unknown to him.

If as an idea He was strange to us, He was rarer as a personality. But here again I am inclined to set a single exception against the general rule. The only case I ever experienced came out of the void on a battlefield. He was wounded. He said to me that he believed in Jesus, and *hence had no fear*. An opportunity soon came to test this remark. We were passing through a barrage, and he could only just walk very slowly. One of the shells fell very close indeed, but I know for a fact he shewed neither fear nor panic, and only paused in his conversation to put up his collar against the clods of earth falling upon us. We spent some time getting through the barrage, and he spoke the whole time in a quiet unperturbed voice.

It is not because there is an increase of religion in war time that attention is directed to it, but because what there is of it

is seen to be reality. Thus by a small number of men in the ranks the Power and Love of God have been acknowledged as certainly as the blatant triumph of Materialism is accepted by others. It is because since the days of the twelve disciples religious values have been qualitative rather that quantitive that I venture to set the exceptions against the general rule. In the triumph of all obvious evil in the form of deaths, partings, pains, and discomforts, when the creeds, catchwords, and Church habits have fallen away from us, whatever remains constitutes the essence of religion, and is therefore the harder to point to. Take the case of prayer. There are few among us who know even the elements of prayer. Men admit often enough that "in a hot place" they "said their prayers." It means little more than the old habit of regarding religion as a kind of Salvationism. I have also heard men declare that such was dishonesty, and that they had never done so. With them I sympathise. Yet few who have known what a moment's real turning to God means in times of stress on active service, the re-assurance and relief that comes from a glimpse of spiritual values when the material are crumbling to view, are likely to forget the experience. But during the "hot moments" the prayers already said are the prayers that count; a man depends then on whatever strength or faith he has established for himself in the past. Hence the apparently irreligious man who refuses to say his prayers in a hot place may be nearer the true conception of religion.

The soldier who is prepared truly to sacrifice his life for what his country stands for has already taken a spiritual attitude if he would but recognise it. Christ said to the young man of great possessions, "Go, sell all that thou hast and follow Me." Thousands of soldiers have fulfilled the first injunction, for all that a man hath will he give for his life. Yet the "and follow Me" remains unperceived. What could not the Churches do for the world if they could only connect the symbols Christ gave us to the knowledge within our hearts.

There must be more known now about suffering and sacrifice than at any past time; but it is all isolated, disconnected, hidden. The Cross is borne, but borne blindly by some, and as blindly repudiated by others. The Cross needs more than ever in war time to be shewn in its truly spiritual light. Those at home who read the papers do not read of those hundreds who go under, whose nerves, physique, character, fail in the long strain. They are conscious only of those who are comparatively successful, comparatively strong. But at the front the knowledge of those who are maddened, corrupted, or destroyed, seems to eat at the roots of our faith, turning all effort to bitterness. To religiously-minded men who survive the trenches the idolatry of the Cross will be more than ever distasteful. I cannot but connect it in my own mind with that acquiescence in evil that many good people seem to have, and which has contributed a good deal to this war. The attitude that through "Him hanging there" all will eventually be forgiven seems to culminate in the present *reductio ad absurdum* of Christian practice in the world. It is specially the attitude of the *Hymns Ancient and Modern.*

But the instinct for self-sacrifice is one of the commonest instincts in men, and the Church does right to sanctify it. It forms also a root-part of Christianity. Once while on duty with gas patients, I had occasion to speak to a friend of mine, a sergeant in the regulars, an R.A.M.C. man, who had seen death and disease in many lands. There is something peculiarly harrowing about the sight of a crowd of gas patients. They suffer a prolonged drowning that lasts perhaps twenty-four hours before they die. I was surprised to see this veteran deeply moved. "This sort of thing," he said, "makes me want to suffer for everyone, and get it over." Sergeant C. was not very religious, nor very thoughtful, yet he had expressed something essentially Christian, the idea of "greater love."

Where such essential religious instincts exist, who shall say that religion is dead? If Sergeant C. himself had ever been

helped to connect up such impulses that were within him to a system of faith and worship which included them, purified and developed them, he and many more like him might be whole-hearted Christians and Churchmen, and derive infinite help in their hard, thankless lives. The appeals that Christianity can make, might be powerfully applied in war time. Few people realise the peculiar burden of insignificance carried by the private soldier. He is one in an army of millions. He knows that a wound may at a moment's notice separate him from his friends in his battalion for ever, but will not insure his reaching England alive. Not one of the least tragic spectacles in the war is that of hundreds of lonely death-beds.

On the other hand the element of devotion to any one great leader such as Napoleon or Lincoln, and the personal factors which it implies, and which might tend to lessen his sense of insignificance, is also lacking.

Yet let a man but think, while he suffers what this war brings him, and at the same time read a chapter of the Gospels every day, and the figure of Christ will rise before him irresistibly. The common affections of thousands of isolated soldiers are as rooms empty, swept, and garnished, open to Christ or open to devils.

Or consider, to minds more developed, the appeal of the Kingdom of God. We have dwelt for months in places of blasting ugliness, in ruined towns, or in holes in the earth like brutes. Yet in and through that experience, there was always the feeling that however shattered the forms of civilisation, the thing itself was something indestructible in the minds of each one of us, and that we could at once, after the war, begin on new forms. To this apply the ideas of Jesus—"the Kingdom of God is within you, &c." The thought arises that whatever shell our civilisation presents, the reality is the more or less Christ-like mind of the nations that erect it. But the more spiritual the inner kingdom of the world, the more difficult will it be to express with harmony and beauty that kingdom

in hard stones, in laws, in systems of ethics, and politics. More and more to-day the forces of religion and the spirit are moving inwards to the secret individual soul. More and more, on the other hand, the forces of Materialism expand outwards, co-ordinating, systematising, standardising human effort relentlessly. In the one case humanity tends increasingly to mean the individual man. In the other the community of men. Yet where but in Christianity, with its twin conceptions of sonship and membership, can a spiritual ideal of these two opposites be united for ordinary men? It was, moreover, part of the desire of Christ that harmony should be obtained, else what is the meaning of His words, "Thy will be done on earth as in heaven."

In failing to love God; in failing to co-operate Labour and Capital, we equally fall short of His desire. Where mankind fails most is indeed less in its aspiration than in the means chosen for its great ends, in the practice of ideals; in other words, in politics.

In this difficult process of infinite adjustment the Churches have not made a strong and firm enough appeal. Towards the building of a new world must be employed will and intellect, and the instinct for health, powers of body and brain; but also other qualities without which statesmen may labour in vain. There must be added to them unselfishness, love, a sense of membership, purity, a discrimination of truth; in other words, qualities exemplified in Christianity. One of our own statesmen spoke truth in the House of Commons recently when he said we are in this war striving less for civilisation than to keep civilisation Christian. But there are sacrifices to be made by the nations in the coming peace, as there are at present in the war. These will require unselfishness rather than fear or self-interest as a motive, and how will that be attained on any large scale without religion?

What we want and look for from the Church is education in Christianity. If the genius of Jesus discovered one thing

hidden from the other great thinkers of the world, it was the mind of common men and women. Christ's appeal was both truly spiritual and truly popular. Where ministers of the Christian religion fail is that they are afraid of a really spiritual appeal. There is still amongst us that quality of direct perception, of sensitiveness of the heart to all hidden things—the quality of simplicity. Yet this excellence is continually lost sight of, because it is the habit of Churches to mistake simplicity for stupidity. But the simple heart has a peculiar discrimination of spiritual values. The Spirit of Christ is, I believe, acknowledged and apprehended to-day on frequent hidden occasions. But we have already discriminated such things as Church parades from that Spirit. Perhaps it is because little but these and their counter-parts are shown us that we appear so irreligious.

Morality, even puritanism, we still have in the technique of life, but it has no longer the crusading spirit, the inspiration that made of it a religion for the soldiers of Cromwell. For good or for evil, the spirit of praising God when you first see the enemy, of trusting in God and keeping your powder dry, no longer exists. Perhaps we have passed beyond it.

Men will worship an Idea or a Person. To-day they have neither. The Idea is never preached by the ministers; the masses are ignorant of Christ the Person. Hence the Church appeals neither to the intellectual nor to the simple. If to the intellectual, the cry is insistent:—Give us reality, give us something to get our teeth into. If to the simple, the appeal must be to the simplicity of Christ, not to the stupidity of an ethical compromise. You must connect up the old symbols to our own hard lives, shew us the old truths still behind them, the old love, the old enthusiasm.

If the Churches, in the courage of Christ, would preach His Gospel to the people, and Himself as the Master of Life rather than of Death, I believe the appeal they could make to us would be answered.

THE SPIRITUAL ASPECT OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS.*

A writer of eminence was one day talking to a Quaker lady. He was full of self-conscious vitality. She was, what the term "Quaker lady" would lead us to suppose,—gentle-spirited, thoughtful, with the keenness of perception which comes of singleness of mind. He had poured out to her the story of his labours—how from rising in the morning till going to bed at night, every minute of his time was occupied in *doing*. And she met it all with the laconic comment: "And when dost thou *think*?" It is one of the difficulties in the lives of men of action, great and small, that the exigencies of life compel constant attention to one particular task. If there is temporary release from the necessity for material action, the spiritual element—the element of thought—must still be concentrated on the problems arising in the same task. There is little time, therefore, to think about the larger issues of life, and to analyse and think out the motives which should influence action.

From this point of view Moses, in organising the life of the people he had to lead, did a service to humanity when he directed them to set apart one day in seven for complete cessation from everyday toil. Without that Sabbath day we might have developed on lines of greater materialism than now characterises us. I take it that it is somewhat from this point of view that your Brotherhood has been formed and meets on Sundays. I have therefore assumed that you will not be unwilling to let me—as an ordinary man of affairs like yourselves—unversed in philosophic systems and unlearned in religious dogma—try to turn our thoughts for the moment to the spiritual motives influencing the problems we have to deal with now and in the near future, rather than to the material

* An Address to the Ilkley Brotherhood, 25th November, 1917.

means by which those motives will have to be translated into action.

Macaulay's New Zealander, sitting on the ruins of London Bridge, is represented as contemplating the broken remnants of our past civilization. It seems more probable that some future generation—the heirs of our present civilization—will contemplate with a merely historical interest our social system with all its environment, on which it seems irrevocably to depend, of economic laws, of philosophic reasoning, of religious dogma, of legislation, of conventions and customs.

We ourselves, in looking back on past centuries, can mark a considerable advance on the civilization of the past. To-day, if we want to reform our religious system, we do not burn those who disagree with us or destroy the buildings in which they carry on their work. We regard such methods as barbarous and cruel, and as positively opposed to our conceptions of ethical and religious principle. To cut off the head of a ruler whose rule we object to would be equally repugnant to our sense of right. If two men quarrel even upon a vital point of honour we should call them fools, and worse, if they tried in consequence to kill each other. If we have difficulty in reconciling and governing a distant colony we do not lay down laws for its inhabitants, and send out an army to enforce those laws; instead, we grant the colony a constitution, and bid her govern herself, thus binding her to us by the gift of freedom.

Many of the methods of the past seem to us to-day not only barbarous and cruel, but also futile—defeating the purpose aimed at and creating worse evils than those they were designed to remedy.

If, then, this is the light in which we regard the events and methods of the past, what will the future generation say of our methods and the events of our time? Their point of view will necessarily be widely different from ours. We have reached our present plane of thought through the gradual evolution of centuries. They will be separated from us

by a great cataclysm, which will have altered the whole aspect of life. We see, as it were, a valley which has been worn out by the gradual action of a mountain stream, the process of wearing out being, except to the close observer, invisible because of the herbage and leafage with which time has covered the banks. What they will see will be a vast chasm, cleft by a world upheaval, in which will lie exposed the fundamental rock and all the products of its detrition,—but the incidental growth of herb and flower and tree, to which we have become so accustomed that they seem to us to be elemental and eternal, will be largely swept away or will have assumed insignificance in face of the strength of the rock and the rich possibilities of the soil.

One longs for the gift of vision to see how our civilisation will appear to those who will be living when the last tremors following the upheaval have passed. But without that gift something may be conjectured if we remember that, after all, they will be of our race inheriting some, if not all, of our characteristics and tendencies. We should be false to our own professions if we doubted which of those characteristics and tendencies must survive the struggle in the throes of which we now find ourselves. For, though we may not have studied in detail the process of development, we do believe, when we look back on the past, that the causes of the difference between the point of view of ourselves and that of our ancestors lie deep down in our conceptions of what is true and just and right.

Moreover, we have loudly declared our purpose in the war to be the destruction of all reliance on despotic power, on self-seeking and oppression, on falsehood and disloyalty, and the establishment of a world-reliance on the forces of freedom, brotherhood, sacrifice, justice, truth, and loyalty. That we have reached the stage of development in which such a declaration has been possible—in which the Nation, as a whole, has been willing to throw all its possessions and powers, material, physical, mental, and spiritual, into such an effort—

that we have reached such a point must be due to the gradual development in the minds of our people of the conception that material strength and material possessions are transitory, and that the permanent values are of the Spirit. For we must remember that we shall have failed if, through any weakening of our own spiritual determination or any lowering of the ideal we have set up, the result of our efforts is anything less than the complete supremacy of the motives and purpose we have proclaimed over the material forces against which we are in arms.

There are times when one fears that political strategy, or schemes of commercial conquest, may lead to such a weakening, but it would seem impossible that any such influences should prevail against the national spirit, which has shown itself capable of so much sacrifice of life and treasure in support of its proclaimed ideals. If, then, our professions are genuine and not a mere flattering unction concealing a determination towards material dominance, and if we succeed in establishing the principles of national conduct that we profess—then the future generation will enter into those principles as part of their inheritance, and will view their own present and the past from the higher plane which we are trying to establish.

How, then, does this affect our view in regard to our present internal social problems? Surely in this, that it furnishes a standard by which we can judge what our attitude ought to be towards these problems.

Will not our successors find difficulty in understanding any attitude towards questions regarding the relations of man to man which does not conform to the principles for which we shall have fought, as properly applicable to international relations? Will they not say that, if we were capable of self-restraint and self-control for the purpose of establishing right relations between nation and nation, we could not be incapable of similar self-restraint and self-control in order to rid ourselves of the taint of intemperance and impurity in our personal

onduct and in our relations one to the other? If we can acrifice life and treasure to procure freedom for the small ations, will it not seem that we must also have been illing to make as great sacrifices to attain the purpose of iving to the less fortunate amongst ourselves the fullest ossible opportunity of freedom to develop their faculties and o work out their destiny? As we have said that this struggle, in hich we are straining every nerve and wearing out every fibre f our being, is a war to end war, will it not appear that much ess effort ought to have been needed to carry out a similar etermination that there shall be an end of war between class nd class in our own country? Instead of applying to our conomic affairs the rigid doctrines of free competition and urvival of the fittest, will it not appear that our dealings with ach other ought to have been governed by the sense of fair-lay and loyalty which we want to see take the place of artful iplomacy and brute force in the dealings of State with State?

It is such questions as these that I suggest the future eneration—imbued with the spirit inherited from our present fforts—may have to ask themselves, unless we apply to our ome affairs the ideals we are seeking to enforce in the outside orld.

After all, the application of such ideals to human relations no new thing. To us, as a Christian nation, it ought to e a fundamental part of our creed that they should be so pplied. They are to us part of the Law of God which existed efore Economic Laws were dreamt of. They are as old as ie time of Moses, and, no doubt, older. They are found the poetry of the Hebrew race. They appear all through e writings of the Hebrew Prophets. Jesus Christ revealed em afresh and gave them new and loftier spiritual significance r His own generation and for all generations to come. His llowers, writing under the influence of the atmosphere He eated, re-affirmed them again and again. The Spirit they present has, during the succeeding centuries, been slowly but

surely making itself felt in all human relations; and the men who have spoken and acted in that spirit stand out in history as the strongest and most permanently influential among the wielders of the destinies of our own and other nations.

It has been the popular fashion to say that the ethical principles consecrated to us by Jesus Christ, are not applicable to the common affairs of life—that they are impracticable in reference to our political affairs and economic arrangements, our commercial relations, and even our schemes of social amelioration and re-construction. The fashion is, I hope, dying out. John Ruskin had something to do with its displacement. Let me quote a few words from him:—

> "The form which the infidelity of England, especially, has taken is one hitherto unheard of in human history. No nation ever before declared boldly, by print and word of mouth, that its religion was good for show, but 'would not work.' Over and over again it has happened that nations have denied their gods, but they denied them bravely. The Greeks in their decline jested at their religion, and frittered it away in flatteries and fine arts; the French refused theirs fiercely, tore down their altars and broke their carven images. The question about God with both these nations was still, even in their decline, fairly put, though falsely answered. 'Either there is or is not a Supreme Ruler; we consider of it, declare there is not, and proceed accordingly.' But we English have put the matter in an entirely new light. 'There *is* a Supreme Ruler, no question of it, only He cannot rule. His orders won't work, He will be quite satisfied with euphonious and respectful repetition of them. Execution would be too dangerous under existing circumstances, which He certainly never contemplated.'
>
> "I had no conception of the absolute darkness which has covered the national mind in this respect, until I began to come into collision with persons engaged in the study of economical and political questions. The entire naïveté and undisturbed imbecility with which I found them declare that the laws of the Devil were the only practicable ones, and that the laws of God were merely a form of poetical language, passed all that I had ever before heard or read of mortal infidelity. I knew the fool had often said in his heart, there was *no* God; but to hear him say clearly out with his lips, 'There is a foolish God,' was something which my art studies had not prepared me for."

It is strange that, after nineteen centuries of Christianity, we should have to admit that there was ground for such strictures. An optimistic excuse might be that it is characteristic of our race, that we do not care to parade our inner motives

Partly this may be because we have such reverence for the practical as distinguished from what we call the sentimental, and partly because we shrink from any appearance of claiming to be better than our neighbours. Individually, we may try to act up to a certain moral standard, but we do not openly acknowledge that standard,—with the result that when we have to act in common or in the public eye we lose sight of it, and have to look for some economic law or some motive of expediency to justify what we want to do.

Whatever the excuse, however, the fact remains that we have passed through a phase of thought (from which I hope we are emerging) which assumes difficulty—even insuperable difficulty—in applying the ethical teaching of Jesus Christ to political, social, and economic affairs, and which concludes, in consequence, that the establishment among us of the Kingdom of God as revealed by Christ is an ideal which cannot be reached. In a sense the difficulty of application is a real one, if we interpret the teaching of Christ as a codification of ethical laws in precise terms. But Christ did not attempt to treat ethical problems from a scientific standpoint, or to define the moral duties of men under any specific circumstances. What He did was to spiritualise, not to materialise, ethics. He dealt with the motives and thoughts of men as at the root of all their actions. He did not lay down any absolute rules of conduct, but tried to instil into men's minds the Spirit of Righteousness, to show how that Spirit is to be won, and how, in its presence, all problems of conduct would be solved. He shewed the Spirit in man—his thoughts and motives—to be the operative force in all material affairs, and in doing so created a basis of conduct for all men at all times and in all affairs, whether individual, communal, national, or international.

Let me put my point in a very simple illustration. Suppose two men, having a dispute, come together to discuss it. If each has a keen sense of his own rights or wrongs, and a determination to insist on them, they would be better to remain

apart, for you cannot so formulate any ethical principle as to give satisfaction to both, or even so as to mete out absolute justice. But if each party approaches the question at issue with a single desire to arrive at a settlement which shall be fair and just to both parties, and for that purpose to understand the point of view of the other, and if need be to make some sacrifice, then the mutual effort to solve the difficulty is likely to lead to a material solution. If the effort is successful, then the solution will be due to the spiritual motives and principles operating in the minds of the parties. In other words, the possibility of a settlement depends on the spirit in which the parties approach and consider the subject at issue.

This, then, is what we mean by the necessity of seeking a solution of social problems on spiritual lines. If we take the teaching of Jesus Christ as our standard, we do not mean that we expect to find in the New Testament any rules as to the material means to be adopted to meet any situation in which we may be placed. Christ laid down no such rules for us. If He had done, we should have been justified in enquiring whether they were in accord with our modern conditions of life or were meant only for the regulation of the lives of His contemporaries and fellow-countrymen. What He did was to enunciate principles applicable to all men, and operative in all times. It is in fact to Him that we owe the spiritual attitude and ideal of conduct which we are now fighting to establish in international affairs.

What we are gradually learning, and what we have committed ourselves to in declaring our purpose in this war, is that the attainment of the spiritual standard and motives of conduct He inculcated is worth the sacrifice of material treasure and even earthly life itself, and is the only means by which we can hope to reach, either in international or in national or individual relations, that Peace which passeth all understanding.

But you may say that this is only pious aspiration, and ask to what practical goal it leads. It is just one of the difficulties

of the advocacy of abstract ideals that they cannot be translated into material terms, and that no one can define beforehand how they will operate on any problems that may have to be faced. But if the Spirit is there the purpose will be attained, not possibly in the way we anticipated, but nevertheless effectually and permanently.

It is for us, then, to act in the spirit of endeavour to establish the same conditions of justice, unselfishness, freedom, truth, and loyalty in connection with the problems we have to face at home as we have proclaimed to be our intention to create in the relations of the nationalities of the world.

Wm. B. Gordon.

MEMORANDUM OF THE COUNCIL UPON THE PROPOSALS OF THE ARCHBISHOPS' COMMITTEE ON CHURCH AND STATE.

The Report of the Archbishops' Committee upon the relations between Church and State deserves the serious and sympathetic consideration of all churchmen. It has provided materials for a reasoned judgment upon the obstacles to efficiency which have been accumulated during three centuries of political change and ecclesiastical inertia. And it offers, for the first time, a systematic proposal for such reforms as may enable the Church to put itself into harmony with the best ideas and movements, social, intellectual, and religious, of our own age. The reception which a great number of churchmen have given to the general idea of the scheme may be regarded as a sign full of hope. For the first time within living memory a serious proposal for Church Reform on a large scale has evoked enthusiasm. We approach the Report, therefore, with every desire to be helpful and not merely critical. At the same time there are features in it which seem to us open to such serious objections that we are unable to recommend an unreserved support. It is eminently desirable, therefore, that the Churchmen's Union should study its recommendations with care and try to arrive at a common policy with regard to them.

Before proceeding to examine these recommendations in detail, we would call attention to the unrepresentative character of the Committee by which the Report is presented. There is hardly any representative of the more liberal clergy. The two statements of theoretical principles as to the relation between Church and State published by the Committee, represent

only one of the schools of thought embraced by the Church of England. The two reports of the Bishop of Oxford and Dr. Frere contain much which would have seemed highly disputable to the greatest Anglican Divines of the past, much which is disputed and denied by all the parties in the Church of England except one, and not a little which would be repudiated by many High Churchmen. We regret that the Committee has not seen fit to ask for or to publish any statement of general principles, even by members of those schools of thought which were, to some extent, represented upon their own body. The Committee have not, indeed, committed themselves to all the theoretical principles contained in the two Memoranda; but the language of the Report itself seems to be coloured by the principles enunciated in these documents.

This is not the place to discuss such theoretical principles as may be called theological: but we feel bound to point out that the Report is largely coloured by certain assumptions concerning the actual or the ideal relation between Church and State. Assumptions are specially dangerous when, as in this case, they are taken for granted without being directly stated.

(1) It is assumed that the bishops have certain "inherent powers and functions" (p. 78), and that the Church as a whole possesses an "inherent authority" (p. 50): and the former phrase is actually introduced into the draft constitution which is to be a schedule of the Enabling Bill. It is not made plain what these rights are nor upon what principle they are based. We submit that the introduction of such a vague phrase into a legal document is likely to be a source of great difficulty in the future.

(2) Not unconnected with this is another assumption, which runs through the Report, that the present relations between Church and State are at best a barely tolerable evil. There is no adequate recognition of the benefits which the State has conferred, and still confers, upon the Church by maintaining a large and comprehensive conception of Church membership, by securing a large liberty of thought for the clergy, by making better appointments to high ecclesiastical offices than are likely to result from any system of Synodical election,[1] and by protecting minorities from coercion or exclusion at the hands of a temporary majority. We should have liked, for instance, some recognition of the fact that the characteristic tenets of each of the three acknowledged schools of thought in the Church have been in turn condemned by the purely ecclesiastical tribunals, and in every case the condemnation has been reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

[1] Those who have studied the results of Synodical election in the Dominions are almost unanimous in regarding it as a failure.

(3) A third assumption follows naturally. The Committee mention one half of their "Reference" only to put it aside. Taking it for granted that the State is naturally hostile to the Church, they decline to consider "how to secure in the relation of Church and State a fuller expression of the national recognition of religion." *The national recognition of religion* is quietly identified with with "the effective power of the State to safeguard itself" (p. 58). Such language is fundamentally inconsistent with the teaching of Archbishop Benson, who wrote "The English Church must be the religious organ of the English people," and of Bishop Westcott, who said that the National Church "must express generally the religious convictions of the whole people." To allow the Committee's assumption to pass unchallenged would be to throw up the whole case for a National Church.

(4) The Church of England *de facto* occupies the double position of being the representative Church of the whole nation and of being one among many organised bodies of Christians in this country. The Report seems to us to lay too much stress upon the latter and too little upon the former of these aspects. By so doing it practically ignores the principle that the whole nation has an interest in the well-being and efficiency of the National Church, and may reasonably claim through the Legislature a veto upon changes in ecclesiastical law.

We cannot regard the present relations between the Church and State as so fundamentally anomalous as the Committee are disposed to do or base the claim for increased autonomy upon any supposed inherent rights of the Church. But when the plea for a reconsideration of the present relations between Church and State in England is based upon practical grounds, when it is based upon the contention that the existing control by the State tends to prevent the Church from effecting such changes in its formularies or its organisation as will conduce to real spiritual efficiency, and in particular such changes as are demanded by the progress of religious thought and feeling, or the alterations in the political and social environment, we have much more sympathy with the aims of the Committee. Attached as most of us are to the idea of a National Church, and desirous of seeing that national character increased rather than diminished, we frankly recognise that it is at the present day (apart from all theoretical objections to such a procedure) simply impossible to get Parliament to occupy itself with the details of Prayer Book revision, ecclesiastical organisation, and the like. It would be unsatisfactory that these changes should be made (even if Parliament were willing to make them) upon the recommendation of a purely clerical assembly, and the existence of two independent Convocations creates considerable practical difficulties. We hold therefore that the only way in which the Church can

obtain such reforms as are imperatively needed is by the establishment of a central Church Council, consisting of three houses—Bishops, Clergy, and Laity; and that measures passed by this body should have legal effect, subject to the power of veto by Parliament. So far we thoroughly and cordially agree with the main principle of the Committee's recommendations. At the same time there are some details of the Committee's recommendations which seem calculated to produce a narrowing rather than a widening of the Church's borders, and to diminish rather than to enhance its claim to be in a real sense the National Church. We therefore recommend members of the Churchmen's Union, while supporting the main proposals of the Committee, to formulate clearly the amendments which they desire; and to avoid committing themselves to thorough-going opposition until it is seen whether their objections can be removed, either by concessions on the part of those who will be responsible for actually introducing the Enabling Bill, or in the course of it passage through the Convocations and the two houses of Parliament.

The amendments which appear to us most necessary are the following:—

(1) *Franchise.* The qualification for the franchise should be such as to include all adults who sign a declaration to the effect that they have been baptised and that they claim to be members of the Church of England. This, or something like it, is the practice of most of the Anglican Churches outside England; and it appears to yield satisfactory results.[2] The confirmation test would exclude millions of persons who are, more or less, regular churchgoers, and in a very real sense members of the Church of England, while it would admit many who happen to have been confirmed when young, but since that time have been in no sense practising churchmen. Nor should it be forgotten that confirmation is, to some extent, a class distinction. For the children of well-to-do churchmen are confirmed almost as a matter of course, whereas among the wage-earners confirmation is exceptional. We would strongly urge, also, that the Church Council should not be empowered to alter whatever definition of Church membership is inserted in the Enabling Act.

(2) *Election.* While we recognise that the proposed system of indirect election to Ruri-Decanal and Diocesan Conferences and to the Church Council is at present inevitable we think it ought to be regarded as a temporary arrangement, and provision made in the constitution for substituting direct election as soon as the time is ripe.

(3) *Parochial Councils.* We regret that the proposed Enabling Act does not confer upon the Parochial Councils any legal powers except

[2] In some cases a pecuniary contribution is also required.

that of electing members of the Ruri-Decanal or Diocesan Conferences. We believe that it is only in connexion with the Parochial Council that laymen of the best type are likely in any number to be induced to take a serious part in the conduct of Church affairs. The legal power of those bodies should be fixed by Parliament and not left to the action of the Church Council in the future. Though the list of functions which the Committee suggests for the Church Council seems fairly satisfactory, there is no guarantee that the Church Council when constituted will actually confer such functions upon them. It should further be made plain that the new Council supersedes the Vestry, and the election and powers of Churchwardens under the new arrangement should be definitely settled. It must be remembered that under the proposed system of indirect election to the Diocesan Conferences real participation by the laity in the government of the Church will only be secured if the functions assigned to the Parochial Councils are sufficiently extended to excite real interest in their proceedings; and that the quality of the persons elected at each stage of the indirect process of election by which the Church Council is ultimately constituted will depend upon the quality of the persons elected in the first instance to the Parochial Councils.

(4) *Women representatives.* We hold that women should be eligible, not only, as proposed by the Committee, to the Parochial but at least to the Ruri-Decanal and Diocesan Conferences, if not for the present to the supreme Church Council.

(5) *Communicants.* We think it would be wiser not to require that all representatives (in the case of the Parochial Council) should be communicants.

(6) *Diocesan Conferences.* We are doubtful whether the special representation of classes ("wage-earners" and "students") proposed by the Report is desirable. But if such a plan be adopted we are sure that the representatives ought to be elected by those whom they represent, not "selected by a committee of each Diocesan Conference" (p. 44). And any such privilege should be extended equally to men and women.

(7) *Constitution of Church Council.* The proposed constitution appears to us to require amendment. It is much too large. The house of clergy and the house of laymen, without members from Wales, would together number 645—almost as large as the House of Commons. Yet it is proposed that they should usually sit as one body, and sometimes with the bishops as well. If it is to be a business assembly the houses of clergy and laity ought not greatly to exceed two hundred each. Supposing the house of clergy to be thus limited, a large reduction

would naturally be demanded in the number of official members proposed by the Report.[3] Whatever system be adopted, we would urge that the deans should not be left out, for they represent sections of the clergy not likely to be otherwise represented. And we recommend that there should be representatives of theological learning as such, one at least being elected by each University which confers theological degrees. At the same time we deprecate the representation of cathedral chapters, which are rarely homogeneous.

(8) *Powers of the Church Council.* The three descriptions which are given in the Report (pages 50, 78, 93) are inconsistent with each other, and all of them open to criticism. Further confusion is caused by two obscure and apparently inconsistent references to "Canons" which may be passed by the Council (pages 49 and 59).[4] It is absolutely essential to have a clear statement of the powers which are to be exercised by the Church Council, and also of the forms of procedure which are contemplated.[5] In particular, there seems to be a contradiction between page 50 and page 78 as to whether the Council has power to deal with questions of doctrine. We hold that it ought to be made quite plain that the Council has this power, and that measures dealing with doctrine should not necessarily originate with the Bishops. We also hold that the Council (subject to the negative control of Parliament) should have extensive powers of dealing with the property of the Church and with patronage. On the other hand, there are some matters in regard to which "measures" of the Council should not become law without a distinct Act of Parliament; *e.g.*, any alteration in the constitution of the Supreme Court of Ecclesiastical Appeal; any diminution of the powers of the Crown in the appointment of Bishops, Deans, or Canons; and, above all, any modification of the Enabling Act itself. To give the Church Council authority to alter the Act of Parliament from which its legal powers are derived would be to give it more authority than is enjoyed by the Parliaments of the great self-governing Dominions.

(9) *Parliamentary Control.* We accept the principle that measures of the proposed Church Council should take effect subject to a power of parliamentary veto. At the same time we desire that this negative

[3] *i.e.*, 25 representatives of chapters, 91 archdeacons, and the provost of Eton. Total 117.

[4] Canons, we read (p. 49), "should be regarded as having authority over all churchmen." Of what nature is that authority, legal or moral? Again, whereas on page 49 Canons are spoken of as a future possibility, on page 59 they are treated as part of the original machinery.

[5] Four modes of procedure seem to be contemplated. There are "Canons" (p. 49.) There are "measures" which can be "dealt with by a Canon" (p. 59). There are "measures" which "require Parliamentary sanction" (p. 59). And there are apparently (but it is obscure) other cases in which a regular Parliamentary enactment is required.

control by Parliament should be a real and effective control. The requirement that the proposed measures should lie on the table for 40 days seems to be by itself an inadequate check upon hasty and illiberal legislation by a purely ecclesiastical body which will represent only a small proportion of the whole Christian community. To suggest exactly what language should be used in the Enabling Act to secure that opposition to the proposed measures shall be possible, and that the matter shall not be disposed of in a surreptitious manner under the "eleven o'clock rule" or otherwise, is a difficult and technical question. We will only suggest (*a*) that the period during which the measure must lie on the table before becoming law should be considerably extended, or (*b*) that a definite resolution of both Houses, though not an actual Act of Parliament, should be required to give effect to the measure.

(10) *Canons.* We look with great distrust upon the proposal that in certain matters the measures of the Church Council shall become law without even lying on the table of Houses of the Parliament upon the recommendation of an "ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council," about the method of whose nomination no information is vouchsafed, and with still more distrust upon the proposal that this Committee should decide without appeal as to whether a proposed measure is or is not such as to require submission to Parliament. In this connexion it is to be remembered that such measures are to bind the laity as well as the clergy, and that it is expressly contemplated that they may prescribe disciplinary regulations under which laymen may be excommunicated. We hold that, if the laity are to be excommunicated (say) for contracting marriages of which the national conscience as expressed by Parliament has approved, or if fresh dogmas are to be imposed upon the clergy of the National Church, this should not be done without at least the negative approval of Parliament. We hold therefore that all Canons without exception should lie on the table for a sufficient period before passing into law.

There are, doubtless, other points of minor importance in respect of which the scheme will need revision; but we have probably said enough to indicate the general attitude which we would recommend the Union to take up. That attitude is one of sympathetic support to the main principles of the scheme, combined with strong insistence upon the necessity for considerable amendment.

Signed on behalf of the Council,

PERCY GARDNER, *President.*
M. A. GLAZEBROOK, *Chairman of Council.*
C. MOXON, *Secretary.*

REVIEWS.

THE RELIGION OF THE FUBLIC SCHOOLS.

In last month's *Modern Churchman*, an article under this heading gave some account of the methods by which two popular bishops desire to see religion taught. They both, I gather, spoke as if a school was a force working *in vacuo*, whose effect could be calculated without any reference to the surrounding atmosphere. It will interest some readers to compare the following *dictum* of one who is recognised as among the wisest and strongest of educational experts:—

> "The difficulty of the vicious circle dominates this, as so many other problems. School reacts on the world, the world on the home, and the home on school; the blame cannot be apportioned; how the circle can be broken it is much more important to determine."

These words are taken from Mr. W. W. Vaughan's contribution to the recently published volume of *Cambridge Essays on Education*.* I would advise all who want to get real guidance on this important subject to read the whole essay. Here I cannot do more than quote a few striking sentences to illustrate three or four points.

Fully realising the problem of school teaching, Mr. Vaughan rejects all such mechanical solutions as the Bishop of London offers, and shows that the present failure is partly due to trust in them:—

> "Christian education has seemed more concerned with the ceremonial duties of religion than with its spiritual enthusiasm, more eager about faith in some particular explanation of the past than about faith in a re-creation of the future, more attentive to the machinery of the organization of the Church than to the words and commands of its Founder. . . . Men have escaped from the relentless simplicity of the Master's commands by attention to the complicated machinery which disregard of them has made necessary."

Mr. Vaughan says wise and weighty words about bible lessons, chapel services, and confirmation. Even more important, perhaps, are the sentences which follow them:—

> "But all these scripture lessons, chapel services, and confirmation preparation, will be powerless to produce a Christian education, if they be not held together by every lesson and by the whole life of the school. Industry and obedience, truthfulness and fidelity to duty, unselfishness and thoroughness, must form the soil without which no religious plant can grow; and these are taught and learnt in the struggle with Latin prose, or mathematics, or French grammar, or scientific formula; as on the cricket field, on the football ground, in the give and take, the pains and pleasures, of daily life."

---

*Cambridge University Press, 7/6. Editor, A. C. Benson.

The teacher often fails for lack of the higher knowledge and deeper thought which are not to be found in ordinary text books. Still more often does he fail for lack of frankness:—

> "More and more are the schools trying to prepare those in their charge for the perils that threaten the physical health and the character of the young; but it is tragic that they should be so unwilling to face frankly the points that will sap a man's faith, and so expose his soul to the assaults of the world and the devil. . . . More harm is done by the economy of truth than by the suggestion of doubt."

Religion ought to enrich life, not to impoverish it by negations. It ought to be presented to every boy, as it was to the first followers of St. Francis, as the greatest of chivalrous adventures, whose reward is the rescue of a world:—

> "Religion at school must touch with its refining power the impulses, aesthetic and intellectual, that become powerful in later boyhood and early manhood. If, as so often is the case, it ignores their assistance, or endeavours to starve them, they may well assert themselves with fatal power to coarsen and degrade the whole of life."
>
> "The Church will have less to do with the world than it had in the past, because it will have shaken off the fetters of the world; it will not be always explaining to the young how they can enjoy the world and yet deny the world; it will not need to explain itself so often, to insist so pathetically on the superiority of its own channels of influence, but it will attract to itself, or rather to the work that it is trying to do—for it will have forgotten self—all the adventurous spirits who are prepared to risk pain and failure as fellow-workers in fulfilling the purposes of God in the world."

By teaching of this kind "a clue will have been put into the hands of each as he travels along the way which he has not passed heretofore. It will not lead all by the same path, but it will lead all towards that 'great and high mountain,' whence 'that great city, the Holy Jerusalem,' may be seen."

Those who read the whole of this admirable essay will feel encouraged as well as enlightened. If the lay schoolmaster, who is doing the work, takes a view of it so much deeper and more ideal than do the bishops who would fain instruct him, there is good cause for us to be hopeful about the future.

M.G.G.

A NEW SPIRITUAL IMPULSE.*

To the writing of this book have gone, in happy union, a fine and generous idealism, a sound sense of the practical issues of life, and an inspiring faith. The authoress defines, with keen but always sympathetic criticism, the defects of modern civilisation—its pathetically mistaken ideals, its over-reliance on machinery and organisation, its neglect of the promptings of the heart. She dwells on the need for a spiritual revival which shall

* *A New Spiritual Impulse*, by L. Swetenham. Pub. James Clarke. Price 2/6.

establish a truer scale of values and socialise the people. In pursuing her main theme, she touches helpfully on many subjects which group themselves naturally around it. The religious movements of the past are made to illustrate and define the character of "the new spiritual impulse." The necessity for democratising the Church's aims and methods is strikingly emphasised, without losing from sight the claims of the individual. She asks:—

> "Can we acquire sufficient spring and elasticity to swing round quickly and, facing the new situation, adapt ourselves to the fresh needs and demands it presents? Or will we remain rigid, immovable and mediaeval, in this modern age of rapid change and movement?"

The question is as searching as it is momentous. The sole important criticism that the reviewer could venture to make is this: The outlook is perhaps a little too hopeful. This seeming excess of optimism, however, is assuredly more of a virtue than a fault; for it strengthens our moral fibre and braces our social enthusiasm. We often fail in the realisation of our ideals, not because they are inherently impracticable, but because our belief in them is flabby, and our estimate of the possibilities of human nature too low. Is there not abundant truth in the fervid statement of the authoress that:—

> "If we could but believe it and receive it—this challenge of the heavens —we might have Pentecost to-day!"

It is certain that the wide circulation of this book would exert a powerful influence in rousing us to take up the challenge and win the democracies for Christ.

J.E.M.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

London Branch.—A meeting was held on Dec. 11th at 33, Bloomsbury Square, by kind invitation of Sir Richard Stapley, who presided. There was a good attendance, and an interesting discussion followed the excellent paper read by the Rev. Dr. Macgowan on "The Church and Socialism."

Surrey Branch.—On Dec. 13th, a meeting was held in the Crypt of St. Michael's Church, Chiswick, by kind invitation of the vicar. A paper was read by the Rev. Ernest Bury, on "Evolution and Purpose." The Rev. W. Bruce Walker took the chair, and contributed to the discussion, in which the Rev. T. P. Stevens and the Rev. Tom Sykes (Congregationalist) also took part.

Manchester Branch.—The following meetings have been arranged for the first session of 1918:—

Monday, Jan. 14th.—The Rev. T. Bingley Boss, Vicar of Goosnargh, Preston. "The Religious Problems of Psychical Research"—Onward Buildings, 207, Deansgate, 3 p.m.)

Saturday, Feb. 9th.—The Very Rev. the Dean of Carlisle (Dr. Hastings Rashdall). "Church and Nation"—(Council Chamber, Church House, 90, Deansgate, 2-30 p.m.)

Thursday, March 21st.—Miss Maude Royden. "The God of the Ordinary Man"—(Milton Hall, Deansgate, 3 p.m.) Chairman: Sir Edward Russell.

Lay Section Committee.—The first meeting of the Committee of the Lay Section of the Churchmen's Union was held at the Church House on 10th January, Mr. W. B. Gordon in the chair. Present: Hon. Mrs. Matheson, Dr. Cyril Norwood, Messrs. Anson, Llewellyn Preece, Hart, P. H. Bagenal, Mrs. Reith and Miss Nussey.

Mr. Gordon was appointed chairman; Dr. C. Norwood, vice-chairman, and Miss Nussey, Westfield, Ilkley, and Mr. L. Preece, 8, St. Ann's Gate, S.W., joint secretaries. Names were submitted for co-option on the committee.

Miss Nussey reported that nearly 200 lay members of the Union had signified their interest and support of the Lay Section, and it is worthy of note that 150 clerical members had expressed warm approval of the movement. Miss Nussey said that already ten readers of the *Modern Churchman* have joined the Union in order to become members of the Lay Section.

Communications on the subject of the Lay Section will be addressed only to those lay members of the Union who have sent in their names as active supporters, but the proceedings of the Lay Section Committee will be published in the *Modern Churchman*, and it is hoped that the editor will be able to give space for the work of the Section.

Membership of the Lay Section involves membership of the Union.

It was decided to fix the annual subscription at 2/6.

A discussion took place upon the question of how best to increase the membership of the Union, and it was decided to send out a circular to lay members of the Section, with suggestions how to achieve this object. Mr. Gordon and Mr. Bagenal were appointed a sub-committee for this purpose. In this connexion it was urged that one of the most useful subjects for consideration and discussion at present is the position of the laity in the Church. Valuable work might be done in instructing lay public opinion upon the general question of Church and State, and also upon the important question of the training of Ordinands.

Another suggestion for lay members was that they should make an effort in their several localities to form small groups for the purpose of study and discussion of such subjects, to which non-members might be admitted. Lists of suitable books for this object can be supplied by application to the hon. secretaries.

It was also suggested that many members might be able to interest their local press in these matters.

Mrs. Matheson hoped that any disused copies of the *Modern Churchman* would be sent by members through the Post Office to soldiers at the front.

Mr. Bagenal urged the importance of making the existence of the Union and its objects more widely known, and suggested the formation of a special fund for that purpose. This proposal received unanimous support.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THREE SERVICES REVISED.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

I agree with you as to the undesirability of including St. Matthew xxviii. 19, in the opening address of the Baptismal Service, and therefore I would ask to be allowed to revise my suggestion so far as to place a full stop after the words "His service and keeping."

As to a Collect for the Marriage Service. The first thing to decide is whether the Collect should take a directly personal tone pertinent to the particular marriage, or be couched in more general terms. The following form, partly based upon Sarum and Leonine prayers, is with great diffidence offered for criticism:—

> Almighty God, whose gracious blessing alone can hallow earthly joys and consecrate human affection, grant that they who have promised to love and cherish each other in the bond of matrimony may alway abide in Thy love, and so advance in the knowledge of the truth that they may be devoted to Thee with their whole heart, and please Thee both in will and deed, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Denton. T. Herbert Bindley.

OUR ATTITUDE TO THE LIFE AND LIBERTY MOVEMENT.

To the Editor of The Modern Churchman.

Sir,

May I thank you for the cautious reply to your esteemed correspondent H.T.M., whose letter headed as above, appears in your current issue, to desire our fusion with the Life and Liberty Movement. Some of us joined the Churchmen's Union in order to obtain necessary reinterpretation or restatement of Christian belief, and it would be distasteful to us to have to fuse with a body which, however distinguised, has, I believe, no rooted objection to the separation of the State from the Church.

Cecil J. Hubbard.

Steeple-Claydon, S.O. Bucks,
28th Dec., 1917.

***The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters.